

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 and 27 have been previously canceled. Claims 26 and 28-80 are pending. With this Response, Applicants amend claims 26, 28-32, 35-40, 43, 45-56, 58-66, 68-78, and 80, and cancel claim 57 without prejudice or disclaimer. All pending claims are shown in the detailed listing above.

Specification

The specification stands objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). The Examiner states, "Correction of the following is required: Specification does not disclose the term 'fragment(s)' as recited in claims (see independent claims along with appropriate dependent claims)."

Applicants have amended the claims to eliminate the term "fragment." As such, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification under 37 CFR § 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o) be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 26 and 28, citing alleged informalities. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants have amended claims 26 and 28 to address the alleged informalities and, as such, respectfully request that the objection to these claims be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 28, 40-42, 52-54, 63-65, and 75-77 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants have amended the claims to address the Examiner's concerns and, as such, respectfully request that the rejection of claims 28, 40-42, 52-54, 63-65, and 75-77 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 26, 28-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (Pub. 2004/0015369 A1) in view of Dean et al. (Pub. No. 2002/0152244A1), further in view of Anderson et al. (Patent No. 5,499,365). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants' claim 26 recites, "A document management system, comprising: a document storage device configured to store at least one XML-electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program and comprising an upper element and a lower element; and a document receiving device coupled to the document storage device, wherein the document receiving device is configured to process one of multiple versions of the XML electronic document according to a version value of the versions of the XML electronic document, wherein data information and time information of contents of the XML electronic document are used as the version value." These limitations are not disclosed, taught, or suggested in Kim et al., Dean et al., and Anderson et al., taken separately or in combination.

The cited references do not disclose or suggest whatsoever any metadata related to a broadcasting program, much less an "XML-electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program and comprising an upper element and a lower element," as recited in claim 26. Nor do any of Kim et al., Dean et al., and Anderson et al. disclose or teach, "a document storage device configured to store at least one XML-electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program and comprising an upper element and a lower element," and a "document receiving device...configured to process one of multiple versions of the XML electronic document according to a version value of the versions of the XML electronic document, wherein data information and time information of contents of the XML electronic document are used as the version value," as recited in claim 26. As such claim 26 is not rendered obvious by the cited references.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and this claim be allowed. Furthermore, because claims 28-35 depend from claim 26 and include further limitations, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) also be withdrawn and that claims 28-35 be allowed.

Claims 36-80 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (Patent No. 5,499,365) in view of Dean et al. (Pub. No. 2002/0152244 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 58 has been cancelled, thus rendering moot any rejection of this claim.

With respect to the remaining claims, Applicants' claim 36 recites, "For an electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program and having a plurality of elements, wherein each element is based on XML, a method for updating one of the elements stored in a client, the method comprising: requesting an updated version of said element of the electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program; receiving said updated version of said element, wherein said updated version is identified by an element identification including an element version, wherein said element version comprises date information and/or time information; and updating said element stored in said client with said received updated version of said element and without replacing the electronic document in its entirety." These limitations are not disclosed, taught, or suggested in Anderson et al. and Dean et al., taken separately or in combination.

The cited references do not disclose or suggest whatsoever any metadata related to a broadcasting program, much less "an electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program and having a plurality of elements," as recited in claim 36. Nor do Anderson et al. and Dean et al. teach or suggest "requesting an updated version of said element of the electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program" and "updating said element stored in said client with said received updated version of said element and without replacing the electronic document in its entirety," as also recited in claim 36. Thus, the cited reference does not render obvious claim 36.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and this claim be allowed. Furthermore, because claims 37-45 depend from claim 36 and include further limitations, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) also be withdrawn and that claims 37-45 be allowed.

Applicants' claim 46 recites, "For an electronic document describing metadata related to a television broadcasting program and having a plurality of elements, wherein each element is based on XML, a method for updating one of the elements stored in a client, the method comprising: requesting from a provider an updated version of said element of the electronic document describing metadata related to a television broadcasting program; and updating said element stored in said client with a version later than a version of said element stored in said client and without replacing the electronic document in its entirety, wherein said later version is identified by an element identification including an element version from said provider, wherein said element version comprises date information and/or time information," and thus includes some limitations similar to claim 36. As discussed above, Anderson et al. and Dean et al. do not disclose or teach such limitations. Thus, the cited references do not render obvious Applicants' claim 46.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and this claim be allowed. Furthermore, because claims 47-56 depend from claim 46 and include further limitations, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) also be withdrawn and that claims 47-56 be allowed.

Applicants' claim 58 recites, "For an electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program and having a plurality of elements, wherein each element is based on XML, a method for providing an updated version of one of the elements, the method comprising: receiving a request from a client for the updated version of said element of the electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program; determining whether a provider has a capability of handling said requests for the updated version; and supplying said updated version of said element in accordance with a determined result,

wherein said updated version is identified by an element identification including an element version, wherein said element version comprises date information and/or time information,” and thus includes some limitations similar to claim 36. The cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest such limitations, and thus do render obvious Applicants’ claim 58.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and this claim be allowed. Furthermore, because claims 59-68 depend from claim 58 and include further limitations, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) also be withdrawn and that claims 59-68 be allowed.

Applicants’ claim 69 recites, “For an electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program and having a plurality of elements, wherein each element is based on XML, a method for replying to a request for updating one of the elements stored in a client, the method comprising: supplying said client with an updated version of said element of the electronic document describing metadata related to a broadcasting program, wherein the updated version is identified by an element identification including an element version, wherein said element version comprises date information and/or time information” and thus includes some limitations similar to claim 36. Anderson et al. and Dean et al., taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest such limitations, and thus do render obvious Applicants’ claim 69.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 69 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and this claim be allowed.

Applicants’ claim 70 recites, “For an electronic document describing metadata related to a television broadcasting program and having a plurality of elements, wherein each element is based on XML, a method for managing one of the elements stored in a client, the method comprising: using a version information of said element of the electronic document describing metadata related to the television broadcasting program, wherein said version information comprises date information and/or time information,” and thus includes some

limitations similar to claim 36. The cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest such limitations, and thus do render obvious Applicants' claim 70.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 70 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and this claim be allowed. Furthermore, because claims 71-80 depend from claim 70 and include further limitations, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) also be withdrawn and that claims 71-80 be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the Application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (415) 772-7428.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

8-3-06

Date

Richard A. Park

Signature

Respectfully submitted,



By:

Philip W. Woo
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 39,880
PWW/rp

August 3, 2006

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
555 California Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94104